

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/612,113

Applicant(s)

KALINOWSKI, PAUL W.

Examiner

Michael I Poe

Art Unit

1732

**All Participants:**(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).(2) Mary Porter (Applicant's attorney).**Status of Application:** New - Divisional

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 30 January 2004**Time:** 4:00 p.m.**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

the potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. Patent No. 4,588,420 (Charvat) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,645,783 (Ansari et al.)

Claims discussed:

12-15

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 4,588,420 (Charvat) and U.S. Patent No. 5,645,783 (Ansari et al.)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner faxed proposed amendments, necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, to the applicant's attorney for review and approval on January 29, 2004 (see attached). On January 30, 2004, the applicant's attorney approved the proposed amendments including the changes handwritten on the attached fax and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment. As noted on the proposed amendment, the examiner stipulated that the amendments to claim .12 were necessary to overcome the combination of Charvat in view of Ansari et al. Specifically, Charvat in view of Ansari et al. would suggest engaging the interior surface of a grinding wheel while providing mechanically neutral support during curing; however, Charvat in view of Ansari et al. further suggests that simultaneously engaging and supporting the exterior surface of the wheel would also be necessary. Therefore, Charvat in view of Ansari et al. would not suggest solely engaging and supporting the interior surface of the wheel as claimed in the proposed claims. The cancellation of non-elected claims 16-19 without prejudice was also agreed upon to expedite allowance of the elected claims. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.